OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCE

Critical Thinking

Unit **F502/01-02:** Assessing and Developing Argument

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2017

These are the annotations, (including abbreviations), including those used in RM Assessor, which are used when marking

Annotation	Meaning
BP	Blank Page – this annotation **must** be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response.
SEEN	To mark each of the additional lined pages and additional objects pages to indicate that these have been seen and taken into account. (only necessary if no other annotations shown on that page)
C	Weak main conclusion Q23 & Q25
C ✚	Strong main conclusion Q23 & Q25
R	Weak reasons Q23 & Q25
R ✚	Strong reasons Q23 & Q25
I	Weak intermediate conclusion Q23 only
I ✚	Strong intermediate conclusion Q23 only
J	Weak Counter argument and response to CA Q25 only
J ✚	Strong Counter argument and response to CA Q25 only
S	Weak structure and development Q23 & Q25
S ✚	Strong structure and development Q23 & Q25
✔	Used to indicate the separate marks given in Q17b, Q20a and b, Q21 & Q24a Used to indicate concision and or other elements in Q23 and 25

Annotations MUST be used on questions 17b, 20a & b, 21, 23, 24a and 25

Section A – Multiple Choice

Question	Key	Text	Type	AO
1	B	Theatre versus football	Identify MC	AO1
2	B		1. Impact of further claim	2. AO2
3	D	Cost of proms	Assumption	AO1
4	D	No more penalty points	Name argument element (R)	AO1
5	C		Assumption	AO1
6	A		Weakness	AO2
7	D		Weaken	AO2
8	D	No aid for nuclear countries	Identify MC	AO1
9	C		Identify P	AO1
10	D		Impact of further claim	AO2
11	A		Necessary and sufficient conditions	AO2
12	C	The great British education system	Identify MC	AO1
13	A		Name argument element (CArg)	AO1
14	A		Assumption	AO1
15	B		3. Impact of further claim	4. AO2

Section A - Analysis of Multiple Choice Passages and Answers

Question			Topic / Answer	Mark	Guidance
1	5.		B	1	a. This is the reason of the argument. b. This is the main conclusion of the argument. c. This is evidence used in the argument. d. This is evidence used in the argument.
2	6.		B	1	This claim neither strengthens nor weakens the argument, as it just reports on the costing method.
3	7.		D	1	a. The explanation that schools promote proms as a memory-making event does not need the assumption that they are. This is not assumed by the argument as necessary for the argument to work. b. This is not assumed. The evidence from MoneyWise shows £186, but the argument does not have to assume that schools should not encourage the specific amount of money to be spent. c. The argument does not exclude any other ways of celebration, it merely focuses on these school proms. This is not assumed here for the argument to work. d. This is the correct answer. For the conclusion that schools are encouraging debt to follow, it is necessary that when families spend money, they get into debt, when in fact they could have used savings.
4	8.		D	1	This is a reason in the argument and leads to the main conclusion that penalty points should be abandoned.
5	9.		C	1	a. The author has not assumed that the different rules *cause* discrimination. The desire to discriminate may be the cause of the different rules for new drivers, rather than vice versa. b. There is no value judgement present in the reasoning on discrimination. Additionally, the author has not assumed that it is wrong in all situations either. The scope of this claim is so wide, it is not necessary to be assumed for the argument to work. c. This is the correct answer. It is assumed that the new drivers are young. The explanation that it is discrimination against the young, following from the evidence that new drivers have different rules, assumes that these new drivers are young people. d. The author uses the example of the licence being revoked to illustrate different rules. The author does not need to assume the revocation of a person's licence generally is a discriminatory action for the argument to work.
6	10		A	1	a. This is the correct answer. The author does assume that penalty points are not a punishment, in the reason 'it is wrong to allow people to add up their crimes without being punished'. b. Conflation occurs when two different concepts are treated as one, and the difference is significant. This is not happening here. c. A slippery slope occurs when someone argues that if one step is taken, it will lead to a series of increasingly dire outcomes. This argument does not have this pattern. d. A straw man flaw occurs where the author distorts or misrepresents the counter of their own argument in order to dismiss this counter. This does not occur here.

Question		Topic / Answer	Mark	Guidance
7	11	D	1	a. This would not weaken the argument, as it just gives clarification of how insurance companies make judgements on the people they insure. This does not weaken the main conclusion that penalty points should be abandoned. b. This does not weaken the argument, but merely gives clarification of the method of punishment given. c. The complexity of the system does not weaken the main conclusion that penalty points should be abandoned. d. This does weaken the argument. If penalty points were considered a greater punishment than a fine, then it would negate the reason that it is wrong to allow people to add up their crimes without being punished, as well as the principle (reason) that there should be no second chances with crime. If the penalty points are perceived as a punishment, then the people receiving this punishment are not having a second chance nor are they adding their crimes without being punished.
8	12	D	1	a. This is the intermediate conclusion of the argument. It is supported by the reason that 'no country should be trying to develop weapons of mass destruction'. It acts as a reason in its own right for the main conclusion. b. This is a reason in the argument. c. This is a reason in the argument. d. This is the main conclusion of the argument.
9	13	C	1	a. This is not a principle. It cannot be used in different circumstances, as it is so specific. b. This claim is not a principle (without assumptions) because does not apply beyond the immediate circumstances of the argument, nor has it given imperative to action (the expectation of the giver does not have to provide a guide for action from the receiver), and has the characteristics of a factual statement, rather than moral guideline. c. This is the correct answer. It is a guide for action and can be applied in a range of different circumstances. d. This is not a principle. It cannot be used in different circumstances, as it is so specific.
10	14	D	1	This claim would weaken the argument. It shows the conflation between nuclear research and nuclear weapons in the argument. By identifying that nuclear research is also for positive outcomes, such as energy, it shows that the research may not be for nuclear weapons and so refutes the argument.
11	15	A	1	It was neither necessary nor sufficient for South Africa to disarm in order to receive the charitable aid. The argument shows that it was a voluntary choice.
12	16	C	1	a. This is a reason in the argument. b. This is the counter conclusion. c. This is the correct answer. It is supported by two reasons: Many people choose to come to Britain for their education and the focus on learning in and outside of the classroom is a strength of our education system, as well as allowing students to study a wide range of subjects.

Question			Topic / Answer	Mark	Guidance
					d. This is a reason in the argument.
13	17		A	1	This is a counter-argument. The counter-conclusion: It has been claimed that the British education system is failing is supported by the counter-reason: as some people leave school without qualifications.
14	18		A	1	a. The author assumes that coming to study in Britain indicates that Britain is the best. b. This is not necessary for the argument to work. It refers to why the reason that the British Education system does enable students to study a breadth of subjects, but this recommendation that it is important is not assumed. c. This judgement of postgraduate study in China does not need to be assumed just from the evidence that 23% of the postgraduates in Great Britain are Chinese. d. The reasoning is not about improvement, it is about the existing state of the British system.
15	19		B	1	a. This is not the correct answer. This additional claim does not strengthen or weaken the argument. b. This additional claim does not strengthen or weaken the argument. It is just responding to an issue of the evidence of the argument. c. This additional claim does not strengthen or weaken the argument. a. d. This answer is incorrect. To be true, it would rely on whether the inference drawn from the evidence at the end of the stimulus passage should be accepted to be a part of the argument. Assumptions are part of an argument's structure, though unstated, as it is necessary for the argument to work. Inferences, as evaluation of the argument, suggests what follows from the evidence, rather than what is present in the argument. As the evidence in the last sentence of the stimulus is presented and is not in itself illustrative of any reason, then the claim in this question cannot weaken the whole argument. It is just giving a response (retort) to the evidence.
			Section A Total	**[15]**	

MARK SCHEME
Section B – Analysing and evaluating argument

Question			Topic/Answer	Mark	Guidance
16			**CONCLUSION** **1 mark:** Removing (the) opportunity to commit crime is the best way the (British) government can reduce crime. *[Para 1]*	1	NB Only credit the words actually written. Do not credit words replaced by dots. **Credit 0 marks** • Reducing the opportunity to commit crime is the best way the British government can reduce crime. *(Paraphrase – changing first word creates a different argument)* • It should be important to reduce opportunities to do the wrong thing *(part of HR Para 2)*
17	a		**PRINCIPLE** **Examples for 2 marks** • Prevention is better than cure. *[Para 4]* • The government is better able to make decisions in people's interest(s) than the people themselves. *[Para 7]* • Important decisions are best left to the experts. *[Para 7]* **Examples for 1 mark** • The government is better able to make decisions in people's interests. *[Para 7] (missing information)* • The government is better able to make decisions. *[Para 7] (missing information)*	2	**For all parts of question 17:** **2 marks – PRECISION** For precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author. **1 mark – APPROXIMATE** • For stating the argument element in the exact words of the author, but adding or missing out information. • **OR** For a reasonably precise statement of the argument element which includes minor paraphrases. **0 marks** • For a statement of an incorrect part of the text. • For no creditworthy material. NB Only credit the words actually written. Do not credit words replaced by dots. NB Any words in brackets are not required but candidates should not be penalised if these words are included. **Credit 0 marks:** • It should be important to reduce opportunities to do the wrong

Question			Topic/Answer	Mark	Guidance
					thing *[Para2]* (if it had said "it is important…" it would have been a principle, but in this context, it is a judgement) • It seems to be human nature to do the wrong thing *[Para 6]* (not a guide to action).
17	b		**INTERMEDIATE CONCLUSION** **Examples for 2 marks** • This is a more efficient way of making sure (that) people obey the law. *[Para 2]* • There is no point in making punishment for crime harsher. *[Para 3]* • The government is better able to make decisions in people's interest(s) than the people themselves. *[Para 7]* **Examples for 1 mark** • There is no point in making punishment for crime harder. *[Para 3]* • The government is better able to make decisions in people's interests. *[Para 7] (missing information)* • The government is better able to make decisions in the people's interest(s) than the people themselves. *[Para 7]* (*Adding 'the' to people creates a different idea*)	2 + 2 + 2	**Use ticks** ✓ **to identify where marks have been awarded in the candidate's answer.** **Credit 0 marks:** • It is already possible for people to be made to do the right thing *[Para 5] (not supported by reasons; the next sentence could have begun "for instance" as it is evidence)* • It seems to be human nature to do the wrong thing *[Para 6]* (*not supported by reasons).*

Question			Topic/Answer	Mark	Guidance
17	c		**HYPOTHETICAL REASONING** **2 marks** If it is important enough for a law to be made, then it should be important to reduce opportunities to do the wrong thing. *[Para 2]* **Examples for 1 mark** • If it is important enough for a law to be made *(missing information)* • If it is important enough for *the* law to be made, then it should be important to reduce opportunities to do the wrong thing. *(makes it too specific)*	2	**Credit 0 marks:** It would be better in future to make it impossible for the coach to start until all seatbelts are being worn. *[Para2]* (*reference to "the future" does not make it hypothetical reasoning*)
18			**CAN THE CONCLUSION BE RELIABLY INFERRED?** **Examples for 2 marks** • No; opportunity and motivation are all necessary for crime to occur so removing any one of them is sufficient to prevent crime. • Removing opportunity is the best way does not mean that it is the only way. • No, the author is conflating "best" and "only" • No, it says the three are needed for crime to occur **Examples for 1 mark** • No • No, there is not enough evidence to prove this • It cannot be inferred as it is just one person's theory • Yes, it says all three are needed for crime to	2	**Award the two marks independently** 1 mark for making it clear that this is not a possibility 1 mark for the explanation of the link between the evidence and conclusion in Para 1. **0 marks** • For a statement that it can be concluded. • For no creditworthy material. **Credit 0 marks:** • Yes, because it is too difficult to remove targets or motivation • It says removing the opportunity is the best way (not clear which way they are arguing)

Question			Topic/Answer	Mark	Guidance
			occur		
19			**APPEAL and EXPLANATION** **Credit 2 marks for:** • (Appeal to) history as [1] as evidence of past performance is used to predict future performance [1] (*reference to text is not essential here*) • Appeal to history [1] as young people's ignorance of the law may change in future [1] **Credit 1 mark for:** • Appeal to history [1] as the author is appealing to the past to suggest how things should be done differently (*an appeal to history is not the same as saying we should learn lessons from history*)	2	**Each mark can be credited independently and in any order** 1 mark for correctly naming the appeal 1 mark for the explanation of the appeal **Credit 0 marks:** • Appeal to tradition as something has been done in the past so reinforcing it will help in the future. • Appeal to popularity as it is saying that most people didn't know the law. • Appeal to authority as it is saying what the government should do. • Appeal to emotion as it is about the risk to young people's lives

Question			Topic/Answer	Mark	Guidance
20	**a**		**ANALOGY Para 4** **Example for 3 marks** • Parents fitting child-locks is compared with government making laws. *(V, W)* Children are being compared with citizens. *(Y)* **Examples for 2 marks** • The government is like the parent and the citizens are like the children. *(W, Y)* • The government is being compared with parents. *(V)* Preventing citizens from harm is being compared with the child-locks. *(NOT W "preventing" is an action not a "thing")* Children and citizens are being compared. *(Y)* **Example for 1 mark** • The government is like parents using child-locks. *(V)*	3	**Use ticks** ✔ **after the second of each correct pairing to identify where marks have been awarded in the candidate's answer.** <table><tr><td>V</td><td>PARENTS</td><td>GOVERNMENT(s)</td></tr><tr><td>W</td><td>CHILD-LOCKS</td><td>Prevention/ laws/ restrictions</td></tr><tr><td>X</td><td>Prevent(ing) access or consumption</td><td>PREVENT MAKING</td></tr><tr><td>Y</td><td>Child(ren), kids etc.</td><td>CITIZENS</td></tr><tr><td>Z</td><td>MEDICINES and CLEANING PRODUCTS</td><td>• WRONG CHOICES • CHOICES which HARM</td></tr></table> Credit 1 mark for each correct, explicit pairing (maximum of 3 marks) **Note that a complete element has to be written, and sub-parts of different elements do not together get credit.** **Note that copying out the section of text in Paragraph 4 does not get credit. Identification of the situations being compared must be explicit.** **Credit 0 marks:** • Just as cupboards which contain medicines and cleaning products have child-locks put on them by parents, the government can prevent citizens from making the wrong choices which harm them. *[quote – not explicit identification of situations being compared].* • The government has to prevent citizens from bad things, like having child locks on a cupboard.

Question			Topic/Answer	Mark	Guidance
20	b		**ANALOGY EVALUATION** **Examples for 3 marks** • Adults are more responsible than children *(E and D)* so this analogy is insufficient for the author's reasoning *(A)* • Government cannot possibly attempt such close control as parents *(E and D)* because parents only usually have to supervise a few children whereas the government is responsible for many citizens *(D again)* so this analogy is insufficient/irrelevant to the author's reasoning *(A)* • It is much easier for parents to fit a child lock *(E)* than for the government to prevent all wrong choices *(D)*; a child lock is a simple object, but the government would have to pass lots of laws *(D)* so this analogy is irrelevant to the author's reasoning *(A)* **Example for 2 marks** • Child-locks have less impact than government measures *(E and D)* **Examples for 1 mark** • Medicines can be good but wrong choices are always bad *(true, but development does not clarify the weakness)* • Nobody would expect the government to have as much control as a parent. *(worded as a challenge)*	3	**Use ticks ✓ to identify where marks have been awarded in the candidate's answer.** **Three marks are independently available:** • An evaluative point (may be worded as a counter) • Development to clarify this weakness (may be worded as "…whereas…" OR a suggested remedy OR two halves of a comparison, OR use of a comparator word such as "more".) • An assessment of the consequences of this weakness on the reasoning *(IMPACT)*. (e.g. sufficiency, relevance, specificity, selectivity, practicality, non-sequitur, conflation) **Examples of evaluative points** • Adult citizens are more responsible than children • Parents can exercise closer supervision than government • Medicines can be good but wrong choices are by definition bad • The consequences have different impacts – personal versus collective **Credit 0 marks** • For stating "this weakens the authors reasoning" • Parents don't always put in child-locks *(repudiation)* • Parents and government are different. • For any response which is a strength or similarity. • Children getting access to medicines is less dangerous than citizens making wrong choices *(this is not necessarily true)*

Question	Topic/Answer	Mark	Guidance
21	**EVALUATION: USE OF EXAMPLE** *[Para 5]* **Examples for 3 marks** • The example of restricting speed removes opportunity for this crime, not all crime (*E*) because there are other types of car crime *(D),* So this does **not fully** support that claim *(A).* • The speed limiter won't work in a 30-mph zone *(D)*, if it is programmed to limit speed to 70 mph *(E)* so it doesn't prove that you will be made to do the right thing *(A)* • Installing and operating fingerprint controls would be time-consuming *(E)* and so not likely to be implemented *(D)* This contradicts the author's description "a few simple adjustments" *(A)* • Seatbelt technology could be a hazard *(E)* when the engine cuts out while the car is moving if the belt is undone *(D) So* this would not be practicable *(A).* **Example for 2 mark*s*** • The example of restricting speed removes opportunity for some crime, not all crime *(E) (A)* So this does **not fully** support that claim *(A).* **Examples for 1 mark** • The technology would be ineffective if passengers remove their seatbelts during a journey. *(E)* • It would be dangerous if undoing a seatbelt would cause the engine to cut out during a journey. *(E)*	3+3	**Use ticks** ✓ **to identify where marks have been awarded in the candidate's answer.** **Three marks are independently available:** • A relevant evaluative point (may be worded as a counter) • Development to clarify this weakness (may be worded as "…whereas…" OR a suggested remedy.) • An assessment of the consequence of this weakness on the reasoning. *(IMPACT)* (e.g. sufficiency, relevance, specificity, selectivity, practicality, non-sequitur, conflation) **Examples of evaluative points** • Claim that all crime can be prevented is overstated. • Preventing somebody from doing the wrong thing will not necessarily mean they do the right thing. • **The evidence is limited** • Speed restriction is only in one speed limit. • Fingerprint controls may not work if you have a damaged finger. • Fixing your seatbelt at the start doesn't ensure you keep it fixed for the rest of the journey. **Cap at 1 mark a repeated or too similar second evaluative point.** **Credit 0 marks** • The technology is not yet in use • People wouldn't buy this technology • It is up to the manufacturers, not the government to install this technology • Evaluation based on other paragraphs e.g. cupboards Para 4.

Question			Topic/Answer	Mark	Guidance
22	a		**FLAW NAME** *[Para 6]* **Examples for 1 mark** • causal flaw • **confusing cause and effect** • confusing correlation and cause • **false cause** • (over)**simplifying causal relationships** • (over)simplifying cause and effect • **post hoc**	1	**1 mark – PRECISION** For precisely naming the flaw in the words required in the specification. (The words in bold are the ones to be found on *Page 14* of the Specification. The others are to be found in the AS textbook by Lally et al & Thwaites page 182-3 and could be accepted). **0 marks** • For naming an unrelated/incorrect flaw • **OR** For no credit-worthy material. **Credit 0 marks** • Simplifying causal conclusions • Conflation of causes • false cause or restricting the options *(scattergun approach which includes an incorrect answer)* • Confusing necessary and sufficient conditions
	b		**FLAW EXPLANATION** *[Para 6]* **Examples for 2 marks** • People walking on the grass may not have been caused by the sign but by a different cause. • The sign may not be the reason why people walk on the grass; there could be a different reason • Walking on the grass does not necessarily have to follow from disobeying the signs. It's just that it's a shortcut. • The author assumes the sign was the reason why people walked on the grass, but they may not even have seen the sign **Examples for 1 mark** • People walking on the grass may not have been caused by the sign. • Assuming one event causes another when actually it doesn't *(no reference stated cause)*	2	**Two marks are independently available:** • Identification of a stated cause (reference to text: the sign and walking on the grass OR being told not to do something and disobedience) • Explanation in terms of existence of a different cause OR suggestion of an alternative cause. **0 marks** • For just a reference to the text. • For a repudiation of the reasoning such as "People don't deliberately ignore the sign" • **OR** For no credit-worthy material.
			Section B Total	**[30]**	

Section C – Developing your own arguments

Question			Topic/Answer	Mark	Guidance
23			**OWN ARGUMENT WITH IC:** SEE APPENDIX 1 **Correct strong conclusion:** Prevention is better than cure **Examples of weak conclusions:** • Prevention can be better than cure. • Prevention is said to be better than cure. • Cures are not better than prevention • Prevention is better than a cure • Prevention is better than cure in many situations **Conclusion is absent;** • if it is implicit e.g. "I agree with this conclusion/claim". • If it is significantly different, e.g. "Preventing crime is better than curing crime" Answers which CHALLENGE, i.e. argue "cure is better than prevention" are capped at 3 overall **Examples of acceptable supporting points**: • cost • risk • regret	12	**Use the following annotations to indicate judgement on all 4 areas assessed in this question:** [C] [R] [I] [S] ✚ add a tick ✓ at the end for concision, or in the body of text for another element, such as an effective example. **Concision** • The bonus mark for concision can **only** be awarded if there is a well-developed and sustained argument. • This mark on Levels 2 and 3 is to recognise that the candidate has been **actively** concise, by selecting argument elements carefully, rather than crediting a short argument which makes omissions. **Intermediate Conclusions** • A **progressive** IC is able to act as a reason on its own for the MC, as well as be supported by a reason. Examiners are recommended to do the "therefore...because" tests to ensure that the IC is sufficient on its own as a reason for the MC. • The presence of the word 'because' in an argument may not indicate an IC. The word 'because' can also be used for explanations and reasons. • The IC cannot be 'double marked' as an IC *and* as a reason. Candidates are required to give 3 reasons, as well as an IC. **Do NOT credit material simply repeated from the Resource Booklet (e.g. copying particular reasons/examples).** **If the candidate has adapted/developed material from Resource Booklet into a new argument, then this is acceptable.**

Question			Topic/Answer	Mark	Guidance
24	a		**2 REASONS FOR** Drivers should not be responsible for whether their passengers wear a seatbelt. **Examples for 2 marks:** • This is because drivers need to concentrate on the road *(an extra clause is not necessarily an extra argument element)* • Passengers should be responsible for their own behaviour • Passengers are autonomous beings who are responsible for their own safety *(an extra clause is not necessarily an extra argument element)* • The driver cannot easily see if rear passengers might have removed their seatbelts. **Examples for 1 mark:** • Passengers should be responsible for themselves *(too vague)* • Because the passenger has chosen to break the law *(limited – missing a step – assumes that the driver should not have to enforce the law)* • It is not the driver's duty to look after the safety of the passengers *(limited – a bit circular)* • The passengers may ignore the driver *(limited – too general – could refer to anything the driver says)* • Drivers need to supervise children *(limited to the situation where the passengers are children)*	2 + 2	**Use ticks ✓ to identify where marks have been awarded in the candidate's answer.** **2 marks – PRECISE** For a relevant and precise reason that gives clear support to the claim. Precision is achieved by reference to the drivers, or to the <u>behaviour</u> of the passengers **1 mark – LIMITED** • For a reason that gives some support to the claim • **OR** for a reason that includes other argument elements, such as the claim in the question **0 marks** • For something unrelated so it does not give support or challenge to the claim e.g. It is fair/unfair *(unclear whether this is support or challenge)*. • **OR** for a statement that is too lacking in plausibility to offer recognisable support. • **OR** for circular reasoning "It is not the driver's duty to check that passengers are wearing seatbelts" • **OR** for no credit-worthy material. **N.B.** Hypothetical reasons and principles used as reasons are valid.

Question			Topic/Answer	Mark	Guidance
	b		**1 COUNTER REASON** Drivers should not be responsible for whether their passengers wear a seatbelt. **Examples for 2 marks:** • This is because the driver is already responsible for their passengers' safety. • However, insurance already makes drivers responsible for their passengers. • If they don't insist on seatbelts being worn they put their passengers' lives at risk. • If the driver cannot control their passengers, then they should not be in the car anyway. • Because the driver can cause significant harm to the passengers which can be limited by wearing a seatbelt *(an extra clause is not necessarily an extra argument element).* **Examples for 1 marks: CHALLENGE** • If the passenger is a young child, then responsibility for what they do falls on the driver *(limited applicability*	2	**2 marks – PRECISE** For a relevant and precise reason that gives clear challenge to the claim. **1 mark – LIMITED** • For a reason that gives some challenge to the claim • **OR** for a reason that includes other argument elements, such as the claim in the question **0 marks** • For something unrelated so it does not give support or challenge to the claim e.g. It is fair/unfair *(unclear whether this is support or challenge).* • **OR** for a statement that is too lacking in plausibility to offer recognisable support. • **OR** for no credit-worthy material. **Credit 0 marks** • The driver has a responsibility to drive safely *(unclear).* **N.B.** Hypothetical reasons and principles used as reasons are valid.

Question			Topic/Answer	Mark	Guidance
25			**OWN ARGUMENT WITH CA:** SEE APPENDIX 2 **Examples ofstrong conclusions:** • There will always be crime. • There will not always be crime. • I agree/I think that there will always be crime. • I do not think that there will always be crime. • My conclusion is that there will always be crime. • My conclusion is that there will not always be crime. **Examples of weak conclusions:** • There will always be crimes. • Crime will always exist. • There will not always be crimes. • There could be no crime **Example of strong counter and response** Some people say that crime will not always be there because the police are becoming more efficient. However, the police cannot develop skills fast enough to counter new internet crime. **Example of a weak conclusion** Some people say that crime will not always exist because CCTV is everywhere now. However, they are wrong **Examples of absent counters and responses** • Some people say that crime will not always exist however, they are wrong. *[counter assertion and weak response].* • Some say the police can get better, but they are wrong.	**12**	**Use the following annotations to indicate judgement on all 4 areas assessed in this question:** C R J S ✚ add a tick ✔ at the end for concision, or in the body of text for another element such an effective example. **Concision** • The bonus mark for concision can **only** be awarded if the candidate has given a well-developed and sustained argument. • This mark on Levels 2 and 3 is to recognise that the candidate has been **actively** concise, by selecting argument elements carefully, rather than crediting a short argument that makes omissions. **Examples of acceptable points:** • Human nature • Original sin • Ingenuity • Lack of education • Increase in laws • Alienation.
			Section C Total	**[30]**	

APPENDIX 1: Marking grid for Question 23

Main Conclusion		Reasons	
Strong (C+)	MC is stated and precisely responds to the question	Strong (R+)	• 3 distinct reasons, without intrusive assumptions and/or flaws • 2 of which giving **strong** support to the **correct** MC
Weak (C)	MC present but different from that required	Weak (R)	1 or more relevant reasons
Intermediate conclusion		**Structure and development**	
Strong (I+)	Progressive IC - supported by one or more reasons and gives support to the correct MC	Strong (S+)	• Sustained, organised and easy to follow (e.g. good and relevant use of argument indicator words). AND • Effective development (e.g. through connecting the reasons, supporting / illustrating / clarifying reasons through explanations / examples)
Weak (I)	Weakly supported by R or weakly supportive of the MC, may be characterised as: • Summary statement • Description of a possible outcome • Statement of the MC reworked	Weak (S)	• Some clarity and organisation. May be repetitive or list like. • May be characterised as emotive / rhetorical reasoning. • Use of irrelevant, implausible or invented evidence.

Level 4
4 areas are strong **12 marks**

Level 3
3 areas are strong, 1 is weak **9 marks**
Credit 1 bonus mark for each:
• *Other argument elements*
• *Concision*

Level 2
3 areas are strong **7 marks**
2 areas are strong, 2 weak **6 marks**
2 areas are strong, 1 weak **5 marks**
Credit 1 bonus mark for each:
• *Other argument elements*
• *Concision*

Level 1
2 areas are strong **4 marks**
1 strong, 2-3 weak **3 marks**
1 strong, 1 weak **2 marks**
1 strong, 0 weak **1 mark**
1-4 areas weak **1 mark**
Credit 1 bonus mark for:
• *Other argument elements*

APPENDIX 2: Marking grid for question 25

Main Conclusion		Reasons	
Strong (C+)	MC is stated and precisely responds to the question	Strong (R+)	2 distinct reasons giving support to the correct MC without intrusive assumptions and/or flaws
Weak (C)	MC present but different from that required	Weak (R)	1 or more relevant reasons to the **correct** MC
Counter and response		Structure and development	
Strong (J+)	**Relevant** counter argument which is **effectively responded** to by reasoning relevant to MC	Strong (S+)	- Sustained, organised and easy to follow (e.g. good and relevant use of argument indicator words). AND - Effective development (e.g. through connecting the reasons, supporting / illustrating / clarifying reasons through explanations / examples)
Weak (J)	Counter-argument **AND** response are offered	Weak (S)	- Some clarity and organisation. May be repetitive or list like. - May be characterised as emotive / rhetorical reasoning. - Use of irrelevant, implausible or invented evidence.
Absent	- Counter assertion and response - OR counter argument with no response - OR no relevant material		

Level 4
4 areas are strong **12 marks**

Level 3
3 areas are strong, 1 is weak **9 marks**
Credit 1 bonus mark for each:
• *Other argument elements*
• *Concision*

Level 2
3 areas are strong **7 marks**
2 areas are strong, 2 weak **6 marks**
2 areas are strong, 1 weak **5 marks**
Credit 1 bonus mark for each:
• *Other argument elements*
• *Concision*

Level 1
2 areas are strong **4 marks**
1 strong, 2-3 weak **3 marks**
1 strong, 1 weak **2 marks**
1 strong, 0 weak **1 mark**
1-4 areas weak **1 mark**
Credit 1 bonus mark for:
• *Other argument elements*

Assessment Objectives Grid

Question	AO1	AO2		AO3		Total	Timing	Specification Reference
1	1					1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (MC)
2		20.	1	21.		1	1-2	3.2.2.1 assessing the impact of further or additional evidence on an argument
3	1					1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (assumption)
4	1					1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (R)
5	1					1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (assumption)
6		1				1	1-2	3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments
7		1				1	1-2	3.2.2.1 assessing the impact of further or additional evidence on an argument
8	1					1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (MC)
9	1					1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (P)
10		22.	1	23.		1	1-2	3.2.2.1 assessing the impact of further or additional evidence on an argument
11		1				1	1-2	3.2.2.2 necessary and sufficient conditions
12	1					1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (MC)
13	1					1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (CArg)
14	1					1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (assumption)
15		24.	1	25.		1	1-2	3.2.2.1 assessing the impact of further or additional evidence on an argument
Section A Totals	9	6				15	20	
16	1					1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (MC)
17a	2					2	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (P)
17b	6					6	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (IC)
17c	2					2	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (HR)
18		2				2	2	3.2.1 identifying conclusions that can be drawn from evidence
19		2				2	2-3	3.2.2.3 identify and explain appeals in arguments (AH)
20	3	3				6	5	3.2.2.1 identifying and evaluating the use of analogies
21		6				6	5	3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments
22		3				3	2-3	3.2.2.2 identify and explain flaws within reasoning (FC/PH)
Section B Totals	14	16						
23				12		12	10-12	3.2.3 develop own reasoned arguments
24				6		5	5	3.2.3 develop own reasoned arguments
25				12		12	10-12	3.2.3 develop own reasoned arguments
Section C Totals	0							
Question Paper Totals	23	22		30				
Expected Question paper Totals	23	22		30				

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning
Telephone: 01223 553998
Facsimile: 01223 552627
Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance
programme your call may be recorded or monitored